

SOCIAL CONTROL AMONGST THE OROKAIVA

681 died within a couple of months, these deaths were said to have been the result of
 254 sorcery. There was no strenuous effort to trace the sorcerer, because knowledge of
 648 this identity would bring the obligation to exercise fatal punishment, which would
 involve trouble with the Administration.

681 Retaliation by direct violence still takes place, although the Orokaiva are
 684 generally careful not to let it have a fatal result. If a woman is found to have
 committed adultery, her husband thrashes her. Traditionally, he has a right to
 take direct action against the co-respondent also, but nowadays he is more likely to
 tell his *naname* (friend), who calls the adulterer a series of uncomplimentary names
 in public and makes his position so intolerable that he will leave the village. The
 offender may go into the bush for a while, but generally he goes to some other village
 where he has a *naname* of his own who will give him shelter and hospitality.

If a woman suspects her husband of adultery, she accuses him loudly in public,
 and if the husband cannot satisfy her that her suspicions are ill-founded, she will
 gather her few belongings in a string bag and set out for her own village. This act
 of the woman, while she is in a mood of righteous anger, is regarded as retaliation.
 "Now," she cries as a parting shot, "you will have no one to cook for you!"
 Actually, it is not difficult for the man to find a friend's wife or some kinswoman
 to cook for him, but the routine of his life is upset.

681 Clearly, the sanction of retaliation is severely limited by the modern prohibition
 of killing, for it is necessarily somewhat abortive without the freedom to carry it
 through. Nowadays, the pattern is to leave the field rather than stay and fight it out.
 In domestic squabbles, either the guilty parties or the wronged ones who are unable
 to retaliate can leave the village until tempers have cooled. If arguments between
 segments of a village recur and seem to be developing into a feud, one section can
 break away to found a new village at a little distance from the first.

Retaliation is impossible when crimes are carried out surreptitiously so that the
 crime is discovered but the criminal is not known. There remains the sanction of
 self-injury, which makes the wrongdoer feel sorry for the wronged one and therefore
 ashamed of having caused him to suffer. F. E. Williams cites two cases of theft
 which illustrate the operation of this peculiarly oblique sanction. To make the
 thief realize the enormity of his offence, the owner of a stolen watermelon hacked the
 rest of his crop to pieces, and the owner of a stolen spear chopped down his house
 where he had left the spear. The injured man aggravates his own injury, so that
 152 [152] pity for him will induce shame in the culprit. This attitude on the part of the injured
 681 man is largely a blend of anger and self-pity. It is called *sisiva*.^{*}

152 This sanction demonstrates how the Orokaiva tends to take revenge upon the
 681 person who hurt his feelings by punishing himself. This is something of this self-
 punishing, too, in the wearing of the *heratu* (plant-emblem) as a symbol of abstention
 from food belonging to or prepared by someone who has wronged him.^{*}

* F. E. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

* *Idem.*, p. 116.